

General Plan 2020
Steering Committee Meeting
July 8, 2000
Minutes

Attendees:

Mark Price	Alpine
George Vanek	Alpine
Mary Lou Quick	Borrego Springs
Margarite Morgan	Bonsall
Chuck Davis	Bonsall
Donna Tisdale	Boulevard
Tim McMaster	Crest/Dehesa/Granite Hills/Harbison Canyon
Marsha Mann	Desconso
Jim Russell	Fallbrook
David Odell	Hidden Meadows
Hank Palmer	Hidden Meadows
Janice Grace	Jamul
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul
Gene Halsel	Julien
Pat Heinig	Lake Morena
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Carl Meyer	Potrero
Brenda Foreman	Ramona Community Planning Group
Carol Angus	Ramona
Vivian Osborn	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
John Ferguson	Spring Valley
Daniel Friedlander	Stephenson Worley
Pete Sorensen	Twin Oaks
Sandra Farrell	Twin Oaks
David Walker	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro

Visitors

Allison Rolfe	Audubon Society
Melissa Royael	Sierra Club
Matthew J. Adams	BIA
Joan Kearney	Property Owner
And others	

Planning Commissioners:

Bryan Woods
Ray York

County:

Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Neal LaMontagne (DPLU)
Leann Carmichael (DPLU)
Chantelle Swaby (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)

Meeting commenced at 9:10 am

First Agenda Item:

Gary Pryor discussed the *Resource Protection Standards and Implementation of the Density Reduction Formula* (continuation from last meeting). He began by outlining how gross yield on property would be resolved and used a specific example to illustrate this using 1 d.u./10 acres. He indicated that wetlands and floodplains are protected due to reducing the yield and by total avoidance and it was agreed that a reasonable threshold on the slope issue must be met.

The topic of transfer of development rights was brought up, but Gary explained that this creates two problems--a) bookkeeping systems not sophisticated enough to deal with this yet and b) shifting growth--infrastructure may not be able to accommodate it.

A side issue was how communities could resolve agricultural diversion of floodwater. It was determined that Borrego would be looked at differently due to their different circumstances (codes need to still be resolved etc.)

The main thrust of this discussion was to first build consensus regarding reduction of density. Everyone was in agreement that there must be reduction of yield in floodplains.

Gary then proceeded to ask the group to determine if it is going to remain proportional... Put development in balance with the environmental policy.

It was proposed that density in the floodway =0 and that floodplain density be cut down to 50% in order to allow building on the buildable portion of the lot acreage. However it was also thought that this 50% would not help because far too much development would be encouraged. It was also suggested that floodplains needed to be treated as a "stay-out-of" situation. At this point, another option was brought up that if 1-40% of land is in the floodplain, then the minimum d.u. would be 1 d.u./20 acres, if 40-80% of land is in the floodplain, then it should be 1 d.u./40 acres and if 40-80% of land were in the floodplain, then it would be 1 d.u./80 acres. Not much interest was generated regarding this, however. It was finally decided that avoidance with a reduced yield would be a preferable and acceptable standard because this land is intrinsically unbuildable.

The motion was passed unanimously for total avoidance (100%) of floodplains and 100% density reduction

BREAK

Meeting resumed at 11:00am

Second Agenda Item

The following policy changes were approved by the Interest groups.

Gary stresses that the main goal is to keep coordination between the city and each community.

Land Use

Goal I Policy I

"Clustering may be used provided it does not allow increases in planned densities, is compatible with the character of the surrounding area, and does not require the extension of urban services...unless community character is improved".

Action:

The addition of the underlined portion was not supported and thus the motion was unanimous to not support the requested change.

Goal IV policy E

"location of new industrial centers shall be based on projected population, demonstrated need, supporting infrastructure, and compatibility with residential."

Action:

The underlined change was quickly approved unanimously.

Circulation

Goal I Policy E

"Site higher density and intensity uses in areas with adequate public transportation"

Comments:

The decision was to either keep this policy in this section or move it to the land use section. It was felt that it 'stuck out' too much.

Action:

Unanimous motion to move this policy to the land use section as suggested.

Policy F

"Encourage establishment of additional nodes and opportunities for public transportation where higher densities can be serviced".

Comments:

A main issue was that transportation plans shouldn't drive land use. Transportation plans should in fact follow land use patterns.

Another suggestion was that where it says "**densities can be serviced**" should be changed to "**densities exist and/or are planned in the land use element**".

Action:

Everyone was in agreement with the wording changes and the motion to accept these changes was passed. It was also decided that the policy should incorporate the word 'establish' instead of 'encourage'. The policy will thus read: "Establish additional nodes and opportunities for public transportation where higher densities exist and /or are planned in the land use element".

Housing

Goal I, Policy A.

Changing the language from "urban" to "village residential" ("*New housing development at urban densities shall be located within or adjacent to existing ~~urban~~ village residential areas*").

Comments:

It was discussed that "to existing urban areas" or "high density areas" should replace "village residential areas", but trying to find the exact terminology phrase to use was getting difficult. In the end the decision was made to leave the term at "urban".

Action:

The motion to not accept the proposed semantic change was accepted. It will now read: 'New housing development at urban densities shall be located within or adjacent to existing urban areas'.

Goal, Policy E

"Encourage urban densities near employment centers."

Comments:

The main concern was that this policy would end up being used as a rationale for plan to put high densities in industrial areas. Others were concerned that this policy was already sufficiently covered within another section of the policy. It was at this point that it was also pointed out that the term 'encourage' should be changed to establish for this policy as well as within Circulation, Policy F.

Action:

Motion passed and seconded to eliminate "E"

Conservation

Policy M.

"Coordinate with cities on wildlife connections and corridors"

Comments:

It was strongly believed that this policy should be strongly supported on the basis that biology is not open to compromise, and also because the policy supported County objectives. An issue that was broached was the idea of coordinating with not only cities, but also other interested local conservancies. This was felt however to be a bit problematic as one could then be looking at many different conservancies, with differing interests and trying to create coordination may be difficult.

Another issue raised was to determine whether this policy should say '*coordinate with cities and affected public agencies on the planning and establishment of wildlife connections and corridors*'. After a bit of discussion, it was decided that it would incorporate the term "core habitat" and not "connections" within the policy.

Action:

The consensus amongst the members was to adopt the policy to 'Coordinate with cities and affected public agencies on the planning and establishment of wildlife core habitat and corridors'.

Policy N

Support federal efforts to set aside lands for habitat protection.

Comments:

The group discussed whether to include the word "federal" or not within the policy. If "federal" was taken out, it was determined that this would be too broad of a policy. On the other hand, if the term "state" or "federal" were incorporated, it was felt that these agencies could have the ability to force other groups back into their hospices, and it wouldn't be to our advantage to just simply support their ideas. We want flexibility at the board level so that we could deal with issues on a case by case basis.

Action:

In the end, it was decided that it would be safer to simply remove this policy. This motion was agreed to by the majority of members.

Safety

Goal I Policy H

"Adjacent cities with service districts shall be annexed tot he district".

Comments:

The general feeling amongst members was to remove this policy.

Action:

Unanimous decision made to remove this policy.

Third Agenda Item

Discussion of additional items and/or comments.

Regarding the letters handed out re: May 5th, the steering committee was asked to go over it and start discussions and provide feedback for the next meeting. The next meeting needs to include discussion for threshold of slopes. As well, a presentation will be made by Jack Phillips. The timeline handed out shows a realistic timeline for the maps.

Testing will be done from August to September. Some adjustments will be made therefore until November, we need to create balance from these adjustments.

The next meeting is scheduled in 2 weeks (July 22nd) to discuss slopes and standards.

Meeting adjourned at precisely 12:00 noon.